

## Remarks

Claims 1-49 are pending in the application. In the office action dated June 5, 2003, the Examiner took the following action: (1) withdrew claims 11, 20-22, 28, 29 and 34-49, as being drawn to a non-elected Species; (2) rejected claims 1, 16-18, 23 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Lanham et al.; (3) rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lanham in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art; (4) rejected claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lanham in view of Drahm et al.; (5) rejected claims 12-15, 19 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lanham in view of Cage; (6) rejected claims 27 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Lanham; (7) rejected claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Lanham in view of Kane; (8) rejected claims 32 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lanham in view of Cage; (9) objected to claims 3-6, 9, 10 and 25 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks.

*I. Rejection of claims 1, 16-18, 23 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Lanham et al.*

Claim 1 has been rewritten to incorporate the limitations of claim 2. Specifically, claim 1 now recites a flow tube and at least one process connection formed from PTFE or PFA.

Since Lanham et al. does not disclose, teach or fairly suggest a flow tube and at least one process connection formed from PTFE or PFA as described in amended claim 1 above, claim 1 is not anticipated by, or unpatentable over, Lanham et al.

Claims 16-18, 23 and 26 all depend from claim 1. Claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance, and as such, claims 16-18, 23 and 26 are allowable for the same reasons as claim 1.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 16-18, 23 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Lanham et al.

*II. Rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lanham in view of Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).*

In the AAPA, Applicants state that "all straight serial path flowmeters currently in the art are made out of metal, particularly Titanium, or **are metal tubes lined with plastic, particularly PTFE or PFA.**" AAPA page1, line 34 – page 2, line 2. The Examiner takes this to mean that "virtually all straight tube Coriolis flowmeters in the art are made of PFA material." This is an incorrect reading of the AAPA. As specifically stated in the AAPA, the flow tubes that currently exist are either metal or **metal with a PTFE or PFA lining**. AAPA page1, line 34 – page 2, line 2.

Applicants further detail the field of Coriolis lined flow meters on page 2 lines 9-17 of the AAPA. Specifically, Applicants state that:

[f]low tubes lined with PFA, as disclosed in U.S. Pat. No. 5,403,533 to Dieter Meier, attempted to combine the positive attributes of both technologies but encountered new challenges that could not be solved until the present invention. Metal flow tubes lined with PFA still allowed metal ions to migrate through the thin coating layer of PFA and into the flow stream, causing contamination. Also, the flow tube material and the PFA liner had different thermal properties. This caused the PFA liner to disengage from the flow tube creating leaks and performance problems. The manufacturing process for lining the metal flow tubes with PFA is also extremely costly."

AAPA page2, lines 9-17 2. This is in stark contrast to the Applicants' invention that discloses the flow tube(s) and process connection(s) being made entirely of PFA or PTFE.

Claim 1 has been rewritten to incorporate the limitations of claim 2. Specifically, claim 1 now recites a flow tube and at least one process connection formed from PTFE or PFA.

Since Lanham et al. in view of Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) does not disclose, teach or fairly suggest a flow tube and at least one process connection formed from PTFE or PFA as described in amended claim 1 above, claim 1 is not anticipated by, or unpatentable over, Lanham et al. in view of Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

*III. Rejection of claims 7, 8, 12-15, 19, 24, 27 and 30-33 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).*

Claims 7, 8, 12-15, 19, 24, 27 and 30-33 all depend from claim 1. Claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance, and as such, claims 8, 12-15, 19, 24, 27 and 30-33 are allowable for the same reasons as claim 1.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7, 8, 12-15, 19, 24, 27 and 30-33 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

**Conclusion**

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants believe that pending claims 1-10, 12-19, 23-27 and 30-33 are in condition for allowance, and that action is respectfully requested. If there are any remaining matters that can be handled in a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney, Curtis J. Ollila, at (303) 938-9999.

Respectfully submitted,  
Duft Setter Ollila & Borsen LLC

Date: 6/18/03

  
Curtis J. Ollila, Reg. No. 47,833  
Telephone: (303) 938-9999  
Facsimile: (303) 938-9995

**Correspondence Address:**

Customer No: 32827